

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending. Claims 1-54 are rejected by this Office Action.

In the Preliminary Amendment filed October 22, 2002, the Applicant amended the title to “A Simulation Enabled Focused Feedback Tutorial System”.

The Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement on February 7, 2002.

Typographical Errors

The Applicant has amended claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27, 29-36, 38-45, and 47-54 to change “a presentation” to “the presentation”. The Applicant has amended claims 39-45 and 47-54 to change “the simulated environment” to “a simulated environment”. The Applicant has amended claims 11-18, 29-36, and 37-54 to replace “An apparatus” with “The apparatus”. A proper antecedent basis is established for the above amendments. In claims 1 and 10, the Applicant has replaced “the students progress” with “progress of the student”. In claims 2, 4, and 11 the Applicant has replaced “the number” with “a number”. In claims 3, 6, and 12, the Applicant has replaced “the work” with “work”. In claims 5 and 14, the Applicant has replaced “the amount” with “an amount”. In claims 6 and 15, the Applicant has replaced “the aggregate condition” with “an aggregate condition”. In claims 8 and 17, the Applicant has replaced “the tone” with “a tone”. In claims 9 and 18, the Applicant has replaced “the example” with “an example”.

Other Claim Amendments

The Applicant has deleted “the steps of” in claims 1-6, 9, 19-27, and 37-45. These amendments are supported by the application as originally filed. In order to maintain a proper antecedent basis, the Applicant has included the following amendments. Regarding claims 37, the Applicant has replaced “a plurality” with “the plurality”. Regarding claim 46, the Applicant has replaced “a student” with “the student” and “goal” with “one of the plurality of goals”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The Office Action alleges that claims 1-9, 19-27, and 37-45 are not claimed to be practiced on a computer and that the claims are not limited to practice in the technological arts. The Applicant has amended claims 1-9, 19-27, and 37-45 to replace “method” with “computer-implemented method”. As amended claims 1-9, 19-27, and 37-45 are claimed to be practiced on

a computer and are limited to practice in the technological arts. Thus, the Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-9, 19-27, and 37-45.

The Office Action further alleges that claims 1-9, 19-27, and 37-45 are not limited to practical applications in the technological arts. The Office Action alleges that the “Applicant manipulated a set of abstract ‘goals’ to solve purely algorithmic problems in the abstract”. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of “receiving a goal, **the goal being associated with a training objective of a student**” and “evaluating the progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the **goal for use in the presentation**”. (Emphasis added.) As amended, claim 1 is directed to useful, concrete, and tangible results. Similarly, claim 19, as amended, includes the features of “presenting information indicative of a goal, the goal being associated with a training objective of a student” and “integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal in a simulated environment goal for use in the presentation”. Claim 37, as amended, similarly includes the features of “receiving indicia representative of a goal into a model, the goal being associated with a training objective of a plurality of students” and “integrating information that provides assistance with achieving the goal into a tutor for use in the presentation”. Claims 2-9, 20-27, and 38-45 depend from claims 1, 19, and 37. Thus, claims 1-9, 19-27, and 38-45 are limited to practical applications in the technological arts. The Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-9, 19-27, and 38-45.

The Office Action further alleges that claims 10-18, 28-36, and 46-54 are unstatutory. The Office Action alleges that “While the ‘system’ recitals in the preambles of claims 10-18, 28-36, and 46-54 make the claims ostensibly drawn to be ‘apparatus’ claims, they are insufficient by themselves to limit the claims to statutory subject matter.” The Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the features of “logic that receives a goal, **the goal being associated with a training objective of a student**” and “logic that evaluates the progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the **goal for use in the presentation**”. (Emphasis added.) Claim 10, as amended, is directed to useful, concrete, and tangible results. Similarly, the Applicant has amended claim 28 to include the features of “logic that presents information indicative of a goal, the goal being associated with a training objective of a student” and “logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal in a simulated environment for use in the presentation”. The Applicant has similarly amended claim 46 to

include the features of “logic that receives indicia representative of a plurality of goals into a model, the plurality of goals being associated with a training objective of a student” and “logic that integrates information that provides assistance with achieving the plurality of goals into a tutor for use in the presentation”. Claims 11-18, 29-36, and 47-54 depend from claims 10, 28, and 46. Thus, claims 10-18, 28-36, and 46-54 are statutory. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 10-18, 28-36, and 46-54.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-54 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 USC 112. The Office Action states that claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph “because current case law (and accordingly, the MPEP) require such a rejection if a 101 rejection is given”. As discussed above, claims 1-54 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 USC § 101. Thus, the Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-54.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001